| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
|--|-------------------------------|---------------------------|
| | 10/697,329 | HAMAGUCHI ET AL. |
| | Examiner | Art Unit |
| | Arnold M. Kinkead | 2817 |
| All Participants: Status of Application: | | |
| (1) <u>Arnold M. Kinkead</u> . | (3) | |
| (2) Ms. Carolyn T. Baumgardner. | (4) | |
| Date of Interview: <u>13 October 2005</u> | Time: | |
| Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative) Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description: | | |
| Part I. | | |
| Rejection(s) discussed: | | |
| Claims discussed: 1,2,3 and 16 | | |
| Prior art documents discussed: Prior art of record and 5,994,972 | | |
| Part II. | | |
| SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: Claims 1 and 16 have been amended to further characterize the differential limiter construct | | |
| Part III. | | |
| ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above. | | |
| 1 | | |
| (Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate) | | |
| (Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applicant/ | Applicant s Representative Si | gnature – ir appropriate) |